

**ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

SUMMARY MINUTES

MEETING OF JULY 27, 2011

The meeting was convened at 7:03 p.m. The following members of the committee were present: Chair Julie Palakovich Carr, Dennis Cain, Soo Lee-Cho, Charles Littlefield, Roald Shrack, and Tom Gibney. Jason Anthony, Sean Hart and Eric Siegel were absent. The following were also present as observers: Jennifer Russel. Jim Wasilak of City staff was also present beginning at approximately 7:20 p.m.

The chair moved to approve the agenda as written. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

Tom Gibney moved, seconded by Roald Schrack, to approve the minutes for the July 21 meeting, with corrections noted. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

The Committee continued discussion of the schools test from the July 6 meeting. Julie Palakovich Carr reviewed the progress of discussion on this issue to date. Charles Littlefield presented a chart showing a comparison of actual school enrollments for the Richard Montgomery cluster with projected enrollments over the five preceding years to analyze the projections for historical accuracy. Roald Schrack presented graphs to illustrate that the projections become more accurate closer to the actual enrollment date. The committee noted that this highlights the lack of accuracy of the forecasting model, and it was further noted that the accuracy of the forecast for the year prior to the actual enrollment is important for predicting the location of portable classrooms, as well as applying the APFS.

The Committee agreed that the algorithm used by MCPS is not sufficiently accurate, and that a more accurate one should be developed, although it was further noted that this is outside of the purview of the Committee. The Committee expressed that better modeling could take into account different factors on an annual basis in order to be more accurate, and that there should be a check or verification system built in.

The Committee then discussed whether this is related to which year the school test should be accomplished in the APFO. It was noted that although the 2-year test would be more accurate compared to testing at the 5-year mark as the County does, another factor should be when students generated by new residential development occurs. Another important factor is when school construction projects are funded for construction, as opposed to the unfunded “paper” schools that get added in year 5 of the CIP budget but may not be real projects.

The Committee also addressed the issue of reserved capacity in schools for projects previously approved but unbuilt for extended periods of time. Discussion followed about reserving capacity at the time of building permit issuance rather than development approval. This potentially would provide a more accurate portrayal of projects sending students into the system in the near term. The school test would still be applied at the time of development approval.

The Committee discussed the final report, with agreement that each team, previously designated, would use Julie Palakovich Carr's presentation to the Planning Commission on July 13 as a starting point for their section of the report.

The Committee decided that all recommendations with the exception of those related to the schools test, would be reviewed and voted on at the next evening's meeting (July 28).

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 p.m.